

## REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-16 and 19-26 are currently pending in this Application. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present claims are respectfully requested.

### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3, and 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pinard et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,940,834) in view of Graham et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0205537), and in further view of Alcorn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,988,138) (i.e., the Pinard-Graham-Alcorn combination). Office Action at p. 3. The Office Action rejected claims 9-16, and 19-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pinard in view of Graham, in further view of Alcorn in further view of Kitain et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,864,871) (i.e., the Pinard-Graham-Alcorn-Kitain combination). Office Action at p. 8. These rejections are traversed for the reasons noted below.

#### 1. Claims 1-3 and 5-8

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 1-3, and 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Pinard et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,940,834, hereinafter Pinard) in view of Graham et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0205537, hereinafter Graham), and in further view of Alcorn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,988,138, hereinafter Alcorn) (i.e., the Pinard-Graham-Alcorn combination). In particular, independent claim 1 recites a computer system for generating personal homepages:

**"wherein the personal homepage for said member is disabled from any viewing on the Internet when said employment status data indicates the member is not employed by an organization."**

Contrary to the stated rejection, Graham fails to teach or suggest that employment status may be used to control any functionality of the system. The Office Action has conceded at page 4 that the web page generating system of Pinard "fails to

disclose a personal database that tracks the employment status of the member and using the status to affect the functionality of the system." The Office Action relies on Graham to cure the deficiencies of Pinard. In particular, the Office Action relies on passages at page 1, paragraph 12 and page 3, paragraph 32 of Graham as allegedly teaching the capture and use of employment status to control access, and alleges that it would be obvious to combine Graham's alleged teaching with Pinard's personal web page system. However, Graham fails to disclose the use of the employment status for any functionality related to access control. Indeed, instead of using employment status, Graham teaches the use of a separate database containing "access control lists" to control access to intellectual property. See para. 0025. Indeed, since Graham provides for other means to control access, one skilled in the art would not use the employment status but instead use the "access control lists" as taught by Graham when combining the teachings with Pinard. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

In addition, the Office Action has conceded at page 5 that "Graham's capture and use of employment status information to control functionality of the system fails to explicitly teach using the information to control access by disabling the web page from any viewing on the network." The rejection relies on Alcorn for teaching "database control access of Alcorn in order to use a database to disable specific webpages." Arguably, Alcorn discloses a system where a user, such as an instructor, has the ability to manually disable the availability of auxiliary web tools associated with an internet-based classroom web page. The Office Action asserts that this teaches the use of a database to control access to web pages. However, Alcorn never discloses that the source used to disable the web tools is from a database, but instead teaches that the tools are manually disabled by the instructor. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

In contrast to claim 1, the Pinard-Graham-Alcorn combination clearly does not teach or suggest that a user may disable any viewing of an individuals personal webpage based on that individuals employment status. At best, it teaches the use of access control lists to limit an individual's access to web pages, or a user's manual

selection to disable webtools that in turn disable webpages associated with those webtools. . Therefore, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Applicants traverse the rejections of claims 2-3, and 5-8, which depend directly or indirectly on claim 1, and are therefore patentable for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.

In addition, claim 3 is separately patentable because contrary to the rejection, Pinard's disclosure of a PBX is not the disclosure of a server to generate web pages. A PBX is a phone exchange that provides telephony communications, which may be controlled via web pages generated by other means, or may provide data for a directory web page generated by other means. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

## **2. Claims 9-13**

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 9-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pinard in view of Graham, in further view of Alcorn and in further view of Kitain et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,864,871, hereinafter Kitain) (i.e., hereinafter the "Pinard-Graham-Alcorn-Kitain" combination).

The Pinard-Graham-Alcorn-Kitain combination fails to disclose the limitations of independent claim 1, as the Applicants have pointed out above, from which claims 9-13 depend directly or indirectly, where "the personal homepage for said member is disabled from any viewing on the Internet when said employment status data indicates the member is not employed by an organization." Kitain fails to fill the gaps of the Pinard-Graham-Alcorn combination by failing to teach using the employment status of a member to disable that member's webpage from any viewing. Hence, dependent claims 9-13 are also allowable, and therefore patentable for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.

### **3. Claims 14-16 and 19-26**

Claims 14-16, and 19-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pinard in view of Graham, in further view of Alcorn in further view of Kitain (i.e., the "Pinard-Graham-Alcorn-Kitain" combination). Applicants traverse this rejection. In particular, independent claim 14 recites a method of automatically generating customized personal Web homepages:

"automatically disabling the personal homepage for any viewing on the Internet when said updated personal data includes data indicating that the member is not employed by the organization."

As the Applicants have pointed out above, with regard to claim 1, the Pinard-Graham-Alcorn combination does not teach or suggest all the limitations of independent claim 1, which are similar in certain respects to claim 14. In particular, these references fail to teach using a member's employment status for automatically disabling a personal webpage for that member, as recited in claim 14. Kitain fails to fill this gap, and the rejection should be withdrawn for this reason..

In addition, Kitain fails to teach periodically retrieving updated personal data for updating that data on a webpage. Rather, Kitain teaches updating data in a database, but fails to teach periodically retrieving that data to populating a webpage with the updated data., as recited in claims 14. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn for this additional reason.

Applicants traverse the rejections of claims 15-16, and 19-26, which depend directly or indirectly on claim 14, and are therefore patentable for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 14.

\* \* \*

Application Serial No. 10/087,158  
Response Dated October 26, 2007  
Response to Office Action mailed April 27, 2007

### **Conclusion**

Therefore, in view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly requested.

If for any reason the Examiner is not able to allow the application, he is requested to contact the Applicants' undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Marc V. Richards  
Registration No. 37,921  
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
(312) 321-4200